APPENDIX I

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

Zakhar Balakirev	; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ; ;	CIVIL ACTION
v.	;	·
City of Philadelphia, et. al.	: :	NO.

In accordance with the Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan of this court, counsel for plaintiff shall complete a case Management Track Designation Form in all civil cases at the time of filing the complaint and serve a copy on all defendants. (See § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the reverse side of this form.) In the event that a defendant does not agree with the plaintiff regarding said designation, that defendant shall, with its first appearance, submit to the clerk of court and serve on the plaintiff and all other parties, a case management track designation form specifying the track to which that defendant believes the case should be assigned.

SELECT ONE OF THE FOLLOWING CASE MANAGEMENT TRACKS:

March 4, 2009 Date	Jay A. Hochberg Attorney-at-law	PLaintiff Attorney for	
		PLaintiff	
(i) Suntains			
(1) Danies 11			
(f) Standard Management -	Cases that do not fall into any	one of the other tracks.	(X)
a ammontar referred to as	cases that do not fall into tracks complex and that need special de of this form for a detailed of	Of Hiterise management of	
(d) Asbestos – Cases involvi exposure to asbestos.	ng claims for personal injury o	or property damage from	
(c) Arbitration – Cases requi	red to be designated for arbitra	ation under Local Civil Rule 53.2.	()
(b) Social Security – Cases a and Human Services den	requesting review of a decision ying plaintiff Social Security l	n of the Secretary of Health Benefits	()
	orought under 28 U.S.C. §2241	through §2255.	()

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

See this case involve multidistrict fitigation possibilities? Yes No No No No No No No N	Address of Plaintiff: 13068 Townsend Road, Philadelph Address of Defendant: City of Philadelphia Law Dept.	·
(Use Reverse Side For Additional Space) (Use Reverse Side For Additional Space) (Use Reverse Side For Additional Space) (It action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation and any publicly held corporation owning 10% or more of its Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a)) (It acts a second to properly included in a carlier numbered swift pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? (It acts as involve mulcidistrict fitigation possibilities? (It acts as a second clasted when yes is answered to any of the following questions: It is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered swift pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? (It is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered swift pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? (It is this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior swift pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? (It is case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? (It is case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? (It is case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? (It is case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? (It is case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously terminated. (It is case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already		
es this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation and any publicly held corporation owning 10% or more of in Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a)) Set Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a) Set Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a) Set Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a) Yes Not Not Not Parent Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a) Not The Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a) Not The Statement Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a) Yes Not Not Parent Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a) Not The Statement Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a) Parent Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a) Yes Not Parent Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a) Not The Statement Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a) Not The Stat		
es this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities? **ELATED CASE, IF ANY:** **se Number: Judge Date Terminated: **il cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions: **Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? **Yes No No No No **Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? **Yes No No No **Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? **Yes No No **Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? **Yes No No **Yes No No **The case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? **Yes No No **The case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? **Yes No No **In No No **In No No No **In Patent No No No No No No No N		
EATED CASE, IF ANY: Judge	(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.)	
il cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions: Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? Yes No No	Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities? PELATED CASE, IF ANY:	Yes No No
is cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions: (as this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? Yes No No No No No No No N	Case Number: Judge	Date Terminated
Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? Yes No No		
Poes this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? Yes No 2 Sthis case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights case filed by the same individual? Yes No 2 IL. (Place in ONE CATEGORY ONLY) Federal Question Cases: Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts FELA Jones Act-Personal Injury Jones Act-Personal Injury Patent Labor-Management Relations Civil Rights All other Personal Injury (Please specify) ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check appropriate Category) ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check appropriate Category) Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(6(V)) that to the best of misonate and the contract and Injury to the best of each part person and the part of contract and Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(6(V)) that to the best of each part person and the contract and Injury of Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(6(V)) that to the best of each part person and the contract and Injury of Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(6(V)) that to the best of each part person and the contract and Injury of Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(6(V)) that to the best of each part person and Injury the local contract and Injury the local contract and Injury that the best of each part person and Injury the local contract and Injury that the best of each part person and Injury the local contract and Injury that the best of each part person and Injury the local contract and Injury that the local contract and Injury that Injury that Injury the local contract and Injury that I		
ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION Yes No		
Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously erminated action in this court? Yes□ No☑ s this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights case filed by the same individual? Yes□ No☑ IL. (Place ✔ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY) Federal Question Cases: Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts FELA Jones Act-Personal Injury Jones Act-Personal Injury Antitrust Labor-Management Relations Civil Rights Televic Rights All other Personal Injury (Please specify) ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check appropriate Category) ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check appropriate Category) Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(a)(2), that to the betty certify:	Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction	as a prior suit pending or within one year previously terminated
s this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights case filed by the same individual? Yes No	action in this court?	Yes□ No⊠
s this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights case filed by the same individual? Yes No	Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or a	ny earlier numbered case pending or within one year
sthis case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights case filed by the same individual? Yes No 2 IL: (Place in ONE CATEGORY ONLY) Federal Question Cases: Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts FELA Jones Act-Personal Injury Jones Act-Personal Injury Antitrust Patent Labor-Management Relations Civil Rights Civil Rights To Products Liability Habeas Corpus Securities Act(s) Cases Social Security Review Cases All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify) ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check appropriate Category) Counsel of record do hereby care the best of new tops and the patent of the	terminated action in this court?	
IL: (Place in ONE CATEGORY ONLY) Federal Question Cases: Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts FELA Jones Act-Personal Injury Jones Act-Personal Injury Antitrust Labor-Management Relations Civil Rights Habeas Corpus Securities Act(s) Cases Social Security Review Cases ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check appropriate Category) ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check appropriate Category) Counsel of record do hereby certify: Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2. Section 3(x)(2) that to the best of my translation that the latter of the rest of my translation of the contract and Other Contracts B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases: In Insurance Contract and Other Contracts Airplane Personal Injury Assault, Defamation 4. Marine Personal Injury Please specify) Motor Vehicle Personal Injury Please specify) 7. Products Liability Asbestos Products Liability ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check appropriate Category) Counsel of record do hereby certify:	Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal or pro-	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
IL: (Place in ONE CATEGORY ONLY) Federal Question Cases: Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts FELA Insurance Contract and Other Contracts FELA Insurance Contract and Other Contracts Airplane Personal Injury Assault, Defamation Antitrust Patent Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts FELA Insurance Contract and Other Contracts Airplane Personal Injury Assault, Defamation Indemnity Contract, Marine Personal Injury Antitrust Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts Insurance Contract and Other Contracts Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract and Other Contracts Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract and Other Contracts Insurance Contract and Other Contracts Indemnity Contract, Marine Personal Injury Assault, Defamation Indemnity Contract, and All Other Personal Injury Indemnity Contract, and All Other Personal Injury Indemnity Contract, and All Other Contracts Indemnity Contract, and Other Contracts Indemnity Contract, and Other Contracts Indemnity Contract and Other Contracts Indemnity Contracts Indemnity Contracts Inde	F, social security appeal, or pro s	
IL: (Place		Yes□ No Mo
Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts FELA Insurance Contract and Other Contracts FELA Insurance Contract and Other Contracts Airplane Personal Injury Antitrust Antitrust Patent Labor-Management Relations Civil Rights Civil Rights The Products Liability Habeas Corpus Securities Act(s) Cases Securities Act(s) Cases Social Security Review Cases All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify) ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check appropriate Category) ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check appropriate Category) Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2) that to the best of my Insurated as well 1.5 folds to the fold of the contracts Insurance Contract and Other Contracts Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts Airplane Personal Injury Assault, Defamation Cheer Personal Injury Products Liability Products Liability Asbestos Products Liability Asbestos Products Liability All other Diversity Cases (Please specify) ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check appropriate Category) Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2) that to the best of my Insurated as well 1.5 folds to the local civil Rule 53.2.	VIL: (Place V in ONE CATEGORY ONLY) Federal Question Cases:	
FELA 2. Airplane Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation 4. Marine Personal Injury 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify) 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability — Asbestos 9. All other Diversity Cases 9. All other Diversity Cases 1. ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION 1. Arplane Personal Injury 1. Marine Personal Injury 1. Mari		
Jones Act-Personal Injury Jones Act-Personal Injury Antitrust Patent Labor-Management Relations Civil Rights Toucher Personal Injury All other Personal Injury Research All other Diversity Cases All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify) ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check appropriate Category) ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check appropriate Category) Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2. Section 3(c)(2) that to the best of my local beautiful to the less of my local beautiful to the	□ FELA	
Antitrust Antitrust Patent Labor-Management Relations Civil Rights Civil Rights The products Liability Habeas Corpus Securities Act(s) Cases Social Security Review Cases ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check appropriate Category) ARBITRATION certify: Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2. Section 3(c)(2) that to the best of my linewisk and the section of my linewisk		- · · ·
Patent 1. Marine Personal Injury 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify) 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability — Asbestos 9. All other Diversity Cases Social Security Review Cases All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify) ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check appropriate Category) , counsel of record do hereby certify: Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2. Section 3(c)(2) that to the best of my linguishers and by the first to the best of my linguishers and by the first to the best of my linguishers and by the first to the best of my linguishers and by the first to the best of my linguishers and by the first to the best of my linguishers and by the first to the best of my linguishers and by the first to the best of my linguishers and by the first to the best of my linguishers and by the first to the best of my linguishers and by the first to the best of my linguishers and by the first to the best of my linguishers and by the first to the best of my linguishers and by the first to the best of my linguishers and by the first to the best of my linguishers and by the first to the best of my linguishers and by the first to the best of my linguishers.	□ Autitrust	
Labor-Management Relations 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify) 7. Products Liability Habeas Corpus 8. Products Liability — Asbestos Securities Act(s) Cases Social Security Review Cases All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify) ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check appropriate Category) , counsel of record do hereby certify: Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2. Section 3(c)(2) that to the best of my linguishes and by the first to the linguishes and by the	□ Patent	
Civil Rights 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability — Asbestos 9. All other Diversity Cases Social Security Review Cases All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify) ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check appropriate Category) , counsel of record do hereby certify: Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2. Section 3(c)(2) that to the best of my linearledge and by the first to the best of my linearledge and by the first to the best of my linearledge and by the first to the best of my linearledge and by the first to the best of my linearledge and by the first to the best of my linearledge and by the first to the best of my linearledge and by the first to the best of my linearledge and by the first to the best of my linearledge and by the first to the best of my linearledge and by the first to the best of my linearledge and by the first to the best of my linearledge and by the first to the best of my linear ledge.		
Habeas Corpus Securities Act(s) Cases Social Security Review Cases All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify) ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check appropriate Category) , counsel of record do hereby certify: Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2. Section 3(c)(2) that to the best of my linearly descend in the last of my linear last of my l	Civil Rights	
Securities Act(s) Cases 9. All other Diversity Cases Social Security Review Cases Please specify		•
Social Security Review Cases (Please specify) All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify) ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check appropriate Category) , counsel of record do hereby certify: Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2. Section 3(c)(2) that to the best of my linearledge and 1.1% of the last of the last of my linearledge and 1.1% of the last of the last of my linearledge and 1.1% of the last of the last of my linearledge and 1.1% of the last of the last of my linearledge and 1.1% of the last of the last of my linearledge and 1.1% of the last of my linearledge and 1.1% of the last of my linearledge and 1.1% of the last of the last of my linearledge and 1.1% of the last of my linear la	_	
All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify) ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION Jay A. Hochberg (Check appropriate Category) , counsel of record do hereby certify: Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2. Section 3(c)(2) that to the best of my knowledge and 1 to 5 to 1.		 All other Diversity Cases
Jay A. Hochberg (Check appropriate Category) , counsel of record do hereby certify: Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2. Section 3(c)(2) that to the best of my knowledge and 1 to 6 to 1	☐ All other Federal Question Cases	(Please specify)
counsel of record do hereby certify: Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2. Section 3(c)(2) that to the best of my important and 1 to 5 decision 3 (c)(2) that to the best of my important and 1 to 5 decision 3 (c)(2) that to the best of my important and 1 to 5 decision 3 (c)(2) that to the best of my important and 1 to 5 decision 3 (c)(2) that to the best of my important and 1 to 5 decision 3 (c)(2) that to the best of my important and 1 to 5 decision 3 (c)(2) that to the best of my important and 1 to 5 decision 3 (c)(2) that to the best of my important and 2 decision 3 (c)(2) that to the best of my important and 2 decision 3 (c)(2) that to the best of my important and 2 decision 3 (c)(2) that to the best of my important and 2 decision 3 (c)(2) that to the best of my important and 2 decision 3 (c)(2) that to the best of my important and 2 decision 3 (c)(2) that to the best of my important and 2 decision 3 (c)(2) that to the best of my important and 2 decision 3 (c)(2) that to the best of my important and 3 decision 3 decis	ARBITRATION C	ERTIFICATION ate Category)
Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action cases the sum of \$150,000,000 exclusive of interest and costs:	counsel of record do herel	ov certific
	Civil Rights Habeas Corpus Securities Act(s) Cases Social Security Review Cases All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify) ARBITRATION C (Check appropri	7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability — Asbestos 9. All other Diversity Cases (Please specify) ERTIFICATION ate Category)
	E:	89232
09232	NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only	Attorney I.D.# if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.
Attorney-at-Law NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.	tify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pendir pt as noted above.	g or within one year previously terminated action in this court
Attorney-at-Law NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.	2/4/2000	-
Attorney-at-Law NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38. fy that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court as noted above.	Attorney-at-Law	89232
Attorney-at-Law NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38. fy that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court as noted above. Attorney at Law Attorney at Law	609 (6/08)	Attorney I.D.#

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION assignment to appropriate calendar.	FORM to be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose
Address of Plaintiff: 13068 Townsend Road, Philadelp	
Address of Defendant: City of Philadelphia Law Dept	t., 1515 Arch Street, Phila. PA 19102
Place of Accident, incident or Transaction:	enue, Philadelphia, PA
	Side For Additional Space)
Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent co	**
(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.I	
Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities? RELATED CASE, IF ANY:	Yes□ No Ž
Case Number: Judge	Date Terminated:
Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following que	stions:
1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending o	r within one year previously terminated action in this court? Yes□ No ☑
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transact	
action in this court?	Yes□ No 🔀
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit terminated action in this court?	or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously Yes No
I. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pr	ro se civil rights case filed by the same individual?
	Yes□ No 🐼
CIVIL: (Place V in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)	
A. Federal Question Cases:	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:
I. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts	1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts
2. D FELA	2. Airplane Personal Injury
3.	3. Assault, Defamation
4. Antitrust	4. Marine Personal Injury
5. Patent	5. D Motor Vehicle Personal Injury
5. Labor-Management Relations	6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify)
Civil Rights	7. Products Liability
Habeas Corpus	8. Products Liability — Asbestos
Securities Act(s) Cases	9. All other Diversity Cases
0. D Social Security Review Cases	(Please specify)
1. All other Federal Question Cases	
(Please specify)	N CERTIFICATION
(Check app	propriate Category)
Jay A. Hochberg counsel of record do	•
Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of n xceed the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs;	ny knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case
March 4, 2009 Relief other than monetary damages is sought. March 4, 2009	logic
DATE: March 4, 2009 Attorney-at-Law	89232
NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury	Attorney I.D.# only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.
certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now percept as noted above.	pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court
DATE: 3/4/2001 Jan A Hoch	41 89232
Attorney-at-Law	Attorney L.D.#

CIV. 609 (6/08)

S 44 (Rev. 12/07)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

L (a) PLAINTIF	FS	DEFENDANTS
13068 Townsend R	oad. Ant. 81	
	dence of First Listed Plaintiff Philadelphia	City of Philadelphia; Police Officers Joseph Wolk and Micha
	(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)	County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Philadelphia
•		(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE
(c) Attorney's (Firm	Name, Address, and Telephone Number)	THE PARTY OF THE P
Hochberg Levin & Z	eiger, 1315 Walnut Street, Phila, 19147	Attorneys (If Known)
(215) 825-5183 II. BASIS OF JUR	ICDIC	City Solicitor of Philadelphia, 1515 Arch Street, Phila 19102
	- Dox Only)	III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintif
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)	PTF DEF
☐ 2 U.S. Government	☐ 4 Diversity	of Business In This State
Defendant	(Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)	Citizen of Another State
IV. NATURE OF S	UIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	Citizen or Subject of a 3 3 Foreign Nation 5 6 6
	OII (Place an "X" in One Box Only) TORTS	
110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL INJURY	LANGRIPA
☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Operation	☐ 310 Airplane ☐ 362 Personal Injury - Med. Malpractice Med. Malpractice	D 610 Agriculture
☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayme & Enforcement of Judgme	Product Liability	☐ 630 Liquor Laws
☐ 151 Medicare Act ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted	O 330 Federal Employers' Injury Product	☐ 640 R.R. & Truck ☐ 820 Copyrights ☐ 460 Deportation
Student Loans	340 Marine PERSONAL PROPERTY	© 660 Occupational Corrupt Organizations
(Excl. Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpaymer	☐ 345 Marine Product ☐ 370 Other Frand	TY Safety/Health ☐ 690 Other ☐ 480 Consumer Credit ☐ 490 Cable/Sat TV
of Veteran's Benefits	350 Motor Vehicle 380 Other D	□ 810 Selective Service
☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 190 Other Contract	355 Motor Vehicle Property Damage	861 HIA (1395ff)
195 Contract Product Liability	360 Other Property Damage	□ 720 Labor/Memt Relations □ 862 Diack Lung (923) □ 875 Customer Challenge
☐ 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY	Injury	730 Labor/Mgmt.Reporting
☐ 210 Land Condemnation	☐ 441 Voting ☐ 510 Met.	740 Railway Labor Act 365 RSI (405(g)) 891 Agricultural Acts
☐ 220 Foreclosure	☐ 441 Voting ☐ 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence	790 Other Leber Listage 892 Economic Stabilization Act
☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment☐ 240 Torts to Land	443 Housing/ Habess Corpus	or Defendant)
245 Tort Product Liability	Accommodations 530 General	895 Freedom of Information
☐ 290 All Other Real Property	445 Amer. w/Disabilities - 540 Mandamus & Oaks	Act Act
		☐ 462 Naturalization Application ☐ 463 Habeas Corpus - Under Equal Access
	Other Condition	Alien Detainee to Justice
	2440 Other Civil Rights	☐ 465 Other Immigration Actions ☐ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes
A I Original 1 7 Re	an "X" in One Box Only) Emoved from 3 Remanded from 3	
Proceeding St	ate Court Appellate Court	Reinstated or 5 Transferred from another district (specify) 5 Transferred from Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	IDITEL description of a	ling (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity):
VII. REQUESTED IN	Police falsely arrested and assaulte	
COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER F.R.C.P. 23 500	DEMAND \$ CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint:
VIII. RELATED CASE IF ANY	(See instructions): JUDGE	,000.00 CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND: ✓ Yes □ No
DATE	SIGNATURE OF ATTOR	DOCKET NUMBER
03/04/2009	Jan	A Horliberg
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	0	
RECEIPT # AM	OUNT APPLYING IFP	Hilber
v.		JUDGE MAG, JUDGE

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

ZAKHAR BALAKIREV

13068 Townsend Road, Apt. 81 Philadelphia, PA 19154

Plaintiff

V.

CITY OF PHILADELPHIA

c/o Law Department 15th Floor One Parkway 1515 Arch Street, Philadelphia, PA 19102

AND JOSEPH WOLK

c/o Law Department 15th Floor One Parkway 1515 Arch Street, Philadelphia, PA 19102

AND

MICHAEL JOHNCOLA

c/o Law Department 15th Floor One Parkway 1515 Arch Street, Philadelphia, PA 19102

Defendants

CIVIL ACTION

NO:

TRIAL BY JURY DEMANDED

CIVIL ACTION COMPLAINT

Plaintiff by and through his attorney Jay A. Hochberg, Esquire and Hochberg, Levin & Zeiger hereby alleges the following:

PARTIES

1. At all times relevant hereto the Plaintiff ZAKHAR BALAKIREV is an adult individual who resides at the address in the caption.

- 2. At all times relevant hereto the Defendant City of Philadelphia (hereafter "City"), is a municipal government agency organized under the laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and with a principal and central office of business located at One Parkway 1515 Arch Street, Philadelphia, PA. 19102.
- 3. At all times relevant hereto, Defendant Joseph Wolk (hereinafter "Wolk") and Defendant Michael Johncola (hereinafter "Johncola") are believed to be adult male citizens and residents of the City of Philadelphia who are employees of the City of Philadelphia Police Department with a principal and central office of business located at Police Headquarters, 8th and Race Streets, Philadelphia, PA. Both are believed to be current City employees and were Philadelphia Police Officers on February 17, 2008.
- 4. At all times material hereto, the Defendant City acted through its agents, servants, workmen and/or employees, specifically the City of Philadelphia Police Department in the furtherance of its legislative mandate.
- 5. At all times material hereto, the police officers in question acted under color of law and within the course and scope of their employment, pursuant to their customs, policies, practices, ordinances, regulations, directives specifically for and of the City of Philadelphia Police Department in the furtherance of its legislative mandate.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

6. This is a civil action whereas Plaintiff was falsely arrested and during the course of his arrest, the arresting officers used excessive force, causing injury to Plaintiff. The civil

rights of the Plaintiff were violated. He was deprived of his liberty. He was assaulted. He was falsely imprisoned.

- 7. On February 17, 2008, Plaintiff was driving his vehicle at or about 3700 Delaware Avenue in the City and County of Philadelphia. Defendants Wolk and Johncola went to that location in response to a complaint of drag racing. Defendants Wolk and Johncola signaled Plaintiff to pull over, which he did. Defendants Wolk and Johncola then physically assaulted Plaintiff, by, among other actions, slamming his head through the glass rear window of Plaintiff's vehicle. Defenants Wolk and Johncola then arrested Plaintiff, and ultimately charged him with numerous violations of the criminal code. Plaintiff languished in jail for nearly one year before he was acquitted of all the false charges made against him.
- 8. At no time did Plaintiff attempt to resist arrest or offer any physical resistance to the police.
- 9. At no time did Plaintiff commit any offense against the laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania for which an arrest may be lawfully made, nor was there probable cause for an arrest.
- 10. At no time did Plaintiff harass, threaten, resist arrest in any way, commit any illegal acts, or engage in any conduct which in any way justified the actions of the defendants.
- 11. The assaults against Plaintiff, his improper and unjustified arrest, transporting, humiliation and the improper search of Plaintiff, his wrongful imprisonment, and the excessive force and assaults against him were the result of Defendant Wolk and Johncola's lack of knowledge of any legitimate cause or justification, and were intentional, malicious, reckless and in bad faith.

- 12. As a direct and proximate result of the actions of the defendants, Plaintiff was arrested, detained, imprisoned, searched and subjected to excessive force, physical and verbal abuse, injuries and trauma without just or probable cause.
- 13. Defendant Wolk and Johncola's conduct and use of excessive force was knowing, intentional, and/or malicious and was calculated to inflict injury to Plaintiff and was not intended to restrain Plaintiff or protect Plaintiff or others from harm.
- 14. Defendants Wolk and Johncola conspired to inflict harm on Plaintiff and deprive him of his constitutional rights.
- 15. The aforementioned acts and conduct of the Defendants and/or the aforementioned conduct their employees and agents were a factual cause of the harm and damages sustained by the Plaintiff. In the alternative, the aforementioned acts and conduct of the Defendants and/or the aforementioned conduct of their employees and agents was the direct and proximate cause of the harm and damages sustained by the Plaintiff.
- 16. The aforementioned acts and conduct of the Defendants and the aforementioned conduct of their employees and agents were a factual cause and the direct and proximate cause of at least the following harm and damages sustained by Plaintiff ZAKHAR BALAKIREV:
- A. Injuries, dysfunctions, impairments, serious impairments of body or bodily functions, pain and trauma to various parts of the body and psyche, some or all of which are permanent including:
 - Trauma and distress;
 - Physical injuries to various parts of the body including the forehead;
 - Flashbacks;
 - Psychiatric injuries;

- Emotional injuries;
- Pain and suffering;
- Emotional distress;
- Mental anguish and distress;
- Humiliation and embarrassment; and
- Other injuries, the full extent of which is not yet known.
- B. Loss or reduction of earnings and/or earning capacity and/or household services from the date of the injuries to the date of the trial of this case including the increases in wages or compensation that Plaintiff would have received had Plaintiff not sustained the injuries in this accident.
- C. Loss or reduction earnings and earning capacity and/or household services from the date of the trial of this case until Plaintiff's death and work life span including the increases in wages or compensation that Plaintiff would have received had Plaintiff not sustained the injuries in this accident.
- D. Medical expenses of Plaintiff related to or caused by the accident from the date of injury to the date of the trial of this case.
- E. Medical expenses that Plaintiff will incur after the trial of this case until Plaintiff's death related to or caused by the accident.
- F. Pain and suffering that Plaintiff has endured from the date of the injury to the date of the trial of this case.
- G. Pain and suffering that Plaintiff will endure from the date of the injury to the date of Plaintiff's death.

- H. Embarrassment and humiliation that Plaintiff has endured from the date of the injury to the date of the trial of this case.
- I. Embarrassment and humiliation that Plaintiff will endure from the date of the trial of this case to the date of Plaintiff's death.
- J. Loss of ability to enjoy the pleasures of life that Plaintiff has endured from the date of the injury to the date of the trial of this case.
- K. Loss of ability to enjoy the pleasures of life that Plaintiff will endure from the date of the trial of this case to the date of Plaintiff's death.
 - L. Attorney Fees.
 - M. Incidental costs.
 - N. Property damage.
 - O. Loss of liberty.
 - P. Possible deportation.
- 17. Defendants' actions were wilful and outrageous in that their motives and conduct as set forth above were malicious, wanton, reckless, oppressive and so egregious as to shock contemporary conscience.

COUNT I

VIOLATION OF 42 U.S.C.A. 1983

ZAKHAR BALAKIREV v. DEFENDANTS

18. Plaintiff alleges each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1-17 of this Complaint and incorporates them herein by reference as if the same were set forth at length.

- 19. Defendants' actions were undertaken as part of the execution of a custom, policy, and/or practice that violated Plaintiff's civil rights.
- 20. Defendants' actions, were taken under colour of state law, are state actions under 42 U.S.C. 1983, and have deprived Plaintiff of his rights, privileges and/or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws of the United States including his right to be free from false arrest, false imprisonment and excessive force.
- Defendants' actions have violated, and unless enjoined will continue to violate, Plaintiff's constitutionally protected rights of freedom of speech and association, substantive and procedural Due Process, and Equal Protection. The Defendants also violated his constitutional rights by using excessive force and arresting him without probable cause.
- 22. The Plaintiff has the right to be secure in his persons, houses, papers and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, and this right was violated, as no warrants were issued upon probable cause or supported by Oath or affirmation or particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.
- 23. On information and belief, the aforesaid actions of Defendants were taken intentionally, wilfully and/or with deliberate indifference to, or reckless disregard for, the rights secured to Plaintiff.
- 24. Defendants' actions as stated herein denied his equal protection of the law in violation of the United States Constitution, the 4th and 8th Amendments, the Due Process Clause of the 14th Amendment, and 42 U.S.C. Section 1983.

- 25. Defendants' actions as stated herein denied Plaintiff's right to due process in violation of the United States Constitution, the 4th and 8th Amendments, the Due Process Clause of the 14th Amendment, and 42 U.S.C. Section 1983.
- 26. Defendants' actions were a factual cause of and/or caused Plaintiff's substantial damages and harm. (See above).

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff ZAKHAR BALAKIREV demands judgment against Defendants for such sums as would reasonably and properly compensate him for injuries in an amount in excess of One Hundred Fifty Thousand (\$150,000.00) Dollars together with delay damages, interest, costs and attorneys' fees and punitive damages.

<u>COUNT II - EXCESSIVE FORCE</u> <u>ZAKHAR BALAKIREV v. DEFENDANTS</u>

- 27. Plaintiff alleges each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1-26 of this Complaint and incorporates them herein by reference as if the same were set forth at length.
- 28. Plaintiff believes and therefore avers that the force used upon him was unnecessary and more force than was reasonable and necessary under the circumstances.
- 29. Plaintiff believes and therefore avers that Defendants, acting in concert and conspiracy with each other, have by the aforementioned actions deprived Plaintiff of his constitutional and statutory rights.
- 30. Defendants' actions were a factual cause of and/or caused Plaintiff's substantial damages and harm. (See above).

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff ZAKHAR BALAKIREV demands judgment against Defendants for such sums as would reasonably and properly compensate him for injuries in an amount in excess of One Hundred Fifty Thousand (\$150,000.00) Dollars together with delay damages, interest, costs and attorneys' fees and punitive damages.

COUNT III – ARREST WITHOUT PROBABLE CAUSE ZAKHAR BALAKIREV v. DEFENDANTS

- 31. Plaintiff alleges each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1-33 of this Complaint and incorporates them herein by reference as if the same were set forth at length.
 - 32. Plaintiff believes and therefore avers that he was arrested without probable cause.
- 33. Plaintiff believes and therefore avers that Defendants', acting in concert and conspiracy with each other, have by the aforementioned actions deprived Plaintiff of his constitutional and statutory rights.
- 34. Defendants' actions were a factual cause of and/or caused Plaintiff's substantial damages and harm. (See above).

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff ZAKHAR BALAKIREV demands compensatory and punitive damages against Defendants, for such sums as would reasonably and properly compensate him for injuries in an amount in excess of One Hundred Fifty Thousand (\$150,000.00) Dollars together with delay damages, interest, costs and attorneys' fees and punitive damages.

COUNT IV - 42 U.S.C.A. 1983 MONELL CLAIM

ZAKHAR BALAKIREV v. DEFENDANTS

- 35. Plaintiff alleges each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1-34 of this Complaint and incorporates them herein by reference as if the same were set forth at length.
- The Plaintiff believes and therefore avers that Defendant, City of Philadelphia, has adopted and maintained for many years a recognized and accepted policy, custom and/or practice of condoning and/or acquiescing in denying equal protection of the law, condoning excessive force, false arrest, and subjecting its citizens to the same type of treatment to which Plaintiff was subjected. Said policy, custom and practice violate the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments of the Constitution of the United States as well as federal statutory law and Pennsylvania law.
- 37. The Plaintiff believes and therefore avers that the Defendant, City of Philadelphia, has adopted and maintained for many years, a recognized and accepted policy, custom and/or practice of systematically failing to properly train, investigate, supervise and discipline its employees, including the individual Defendants, regarding individuals' right to equal protection and to be free from being falsely arrested with excessive force, which policy and/or custom and/or practice violates the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States, the laws of the United States and of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.
- 38. The Defendant, City of Philadelphia, has been deliberately indifferent to the rights of City citizens to be given equal protection of the law and not be subject to excessive force, which deliberate indifference violates the Plaintiff's rights under the Fourth and Fourteenth

Amendments to the Constitution of the United States, the laws of the United States and of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

- 39. The Plaintiff believes and therefore avers, that at all material times, Defendant, City of Philadelphia, knew or should have known of the above described policy, custom and practice of the Philadelphia Police Department, and that its Police Officers engaged in conduct that posed a pervasive and unreasonable risk of constitutional injury to citizens like Plaintiff, and that they deliberately, knowingly and intentionally failed to take measures to stop or limit the policy, custom and practice and therefore acquiesced in, and were deliberately indifferent to, the aforementioned unconstitutional conduct and policy.
- 40. By failing to take action to stop or limit the policy and/or custom and/or practice by remaining deliberately indifferent to the systematic abuse which occurred in accordance with and as a direct and proximate result of the policy, Defendant, City of Philadelphia, condoned, acquiesced in, participated in, and perpetrated the policy in violation of the Plaintiff's rights under the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States, the laws of the United States and of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.
- 41. The conduct of the City of Philadelphia and/or the conduct of defendants' employees or agents, including the Police Commissioner, and/or policy maker for the City of Philadelphia, were a factual cause of and/or the cause of the harm and damages sustained by Plaintiff. (See above).

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff ZAKHAR BALAKIREV demands compensatory and punitive damages against Defendants, for such sums as would reasonably and properly compensate him

for injuries in an amount in excess of One Hundred Fifty Thousand (\$150,000.00) Dollars together with delay damages, interest, costs and attorneys' fees and punitive damages.

COUNT V - ASSAULT and BATTERY

ZAKHAR BALAKIREV v. DEFENDANTS

- 42. Plaintiff alleges each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1-41 of this Complaint and incorporates them herein by reference as if the same were set forth at length.
- 43. The above-described actions of Defendants Wolk and Johncola constitute a battery because their intentional physical contact of touching the Plaintiff was harmful and/or offensive gave the Plaintiff reason to fear or expect immediate bodily harm, and, in fact, caused bodily harm.
- 44. Plaintiff believes and therefore avers that Defendants Wolk and Johncola, acting within the course and scope of their authority, wrongfully and unlawfully assaulted and battered the Plaintiff, as more particularly described hereinabove.
- 45. Plaintiff specifically complains of the conduct of Defendants Wolk and Johncola in menacing, threatening, harassing and physically abusing him, all of which placed him in imminent fear of bodily harm.
- 46. The above-described actions of Defendants Wolk and Johncola placed the Plaintiff in the reasonable fear of imminent bodily harm and resulted in the Plaintiff being unlawfully and improperly assaulted against his will.
- 47. Defendants Wolk and Johncola's malicious, intentional and/or reckless actions were a factual cause of and/or caused Plaintiff's substantial damages and harm. (See above).

48. The above-described actions of Defendants Wolk and Johncola were so malicious, intentional, and reckless and displayed such a reckless indifference to the Plaintiff's rights and well being, that the imposition of punitive damages is warranted.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff ZAKHAR BALAKIREV demands compensatory and punitive damages against Defendants Wolk and Johncola for the common law tort of assault and battery, for such sums as would reasonably and properly compensate him for injuries in an amount in excess of One Hundred Fifty Thousand (\$150,000.00) Dollars together with delay damages, interest, costs and attorneys' fees, and punitive damages.

<u>COUNT VI - FALSE ARREST</u> <u>ZAKHAR BALAKIREV v. DEFENDANTS</u>

- 49. Plaintiff alleges each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1-48 of this Complaint and incorporates them herein by reference as if the same were set forth at length.
- 50. Plaintiff believes and therefore avers that Defendants Wolk and Johncola through their actions, as more fully set forth in the preceding paragraphs of this complaint, did intentionally falsely arrest Plaintiff.
- 51. The above-described malicious, intentional acts of Defendants Wolk and Johncola were outrageous, atrocious, and completely intolerable in a civilized society and went beyond all possible bounds of decency.
- 52. The malicious, intentional and/or reckless actions of Defendants Wolk and Johncola were a factual cause of and/or caused the Plaintiff's injuries and harm that are described above. (See above).

53. The above-described actions of Defendants Wolk and Johncola were so malicious and intentional and displayed such a reckless indifference to the Plaintiff's rights and well being, that the imposition of punitive damages is warranted.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff ZAKHAR BALAKIREV demands compensatory and punitive damages against Defendants Wolk and Johncola for the common law tort of false arrest, for such sums as would reasonably and properly compensate his for injuries in excess of One Hundred Fifty Thousand (\$150,000.00) Dollars together with delay damages, interest, costs and attorneys' fees and punitive damages.

COUNT VII - CIVIL CONSPIRACY

ZAKHAR BALAKIREV v. DEFENDANTS

- 54. Plaintiff alleges each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1-53 of this Complaint and incorporates them herein by reference as if the same were set forth at length.
- 55. Plaintiff believes and therefore avers that Defendants Wolk and Johncola, through their actions, as more fully set forth in the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint, did intentionally conspire, while acting within the course and scope of their authority, to unlawfully assault, arrest, and imprison Plaintiff, which ultimately caused Plaintiff substantial damages and harm.
- 56. Defendants Wolk and Johncola's civil conspiracy for their malicious, intentional and/or reckless actions were a factual cause of and/or caused Plaintiff's substantial damages and harm. (See above).

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff ZAKHAR BALAKIREV demands compensatory and punitive damages against Defendants, for such sums as would reasonably and properly compensate him for injuries in excess of One Hundred Fifty Thousand (\$150,000.00) Dollars together with delay damages, interest, costs and attorneys' fees and punitive damages.

<u>COUNT VIII - FALSE IMPRISONMENT</u> <u>ZAKHAR BALAKIREV v. DEFENDANTS</u>

- 57. Plaintiff alleges each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 56 of this Complaint and incorporates them herein by reference as if the same were set forth at length.
- 58. Plaintiff believes and therefore avers that Defendants Wolk and Johncola through their actions, as more fully set forth in the preceding paragraphs of this complaint, did intentionally falsely imprison Plaintiff.
- 59. The above-described malicious, intentional acts of Defendants Wolk and Johncola were outrageous, atrocious, and completely intolerable in a civilized society and went beyond all possible bounds of decency.
- 60. The malicious, intentional and/or reckless actions of Defendants Wolk and Johncola were a factual cause of and/or caused the Plaintiff's injuries and harm that are described above. (See above).
- 61. The above-described actions of Defendants Wolk and Johncola were so malicious and intentional and displayed such a reckless indifference to the Plaintiff's rights and well being, that the imposition of punitive damages is warranted.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff ZAKHAR BALAKIREV demands compensatory and punitive damages against Defendants Wolk and Johncola for the common law tort of false imprisonment,

for such sums as would reasonably and properly compensate his for injuries in excess of One Hundred Fifty Thousand (\$150,000.00) Dollars together with delay damages, interest, costs and attorneys' fees and punitive damages.

Respectfully submitted,

BY: JAY A. HOCHBERG, ESQUIRE HOCHBERG, LEVIN & ZEIGER 1315 WALNUT STREET, SUITE 716 PHILADELPHIA, PA 19107 I.D. 89232 (215) 825-5183 jay@hlzlaw.com

Verification

I, Jay A. Hochberg, Esquire, hereby state that I am the attorney for the Plaintiff in this action and verify that the statements made in the foregoing Complaint are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information and belief. I understand that the statements are made under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.

3/24/2009 DATE

JAY A. HOCHBERG